## **Case**

The value is

1. Justice,

followed by

2. Honor

3. Anarchy

4. Governmental Legitimacy

5. Dishonor

6. The power to overcome

7. Autonomy

8. Lamp

Though I would personally reject all of those, 4 and 9 carry a prima facie burden.

However, I will offer this lens through which to view or not to view this round: ***absurdism, which is the acceptance of our inability to discover absolute objectivity by perception and meaning in life.***

**Revert**, Matthew **in 12** writes (http://trashcomplex.wordpress.com/2012/01/24/a-personal-reflection-on-absurdism-in-writing/)

If we revisit the psychology of perception, we find that **what we perceive is the foundation of our understanding**. We also find that **the perception responsible for our understanding is inaccurate and prone to mistakes**. The white noise of our world can’t be broken down into every part and evaluated independently. We need to group, label, stereotype and simplify the stimulus into manageable chunks. We don’t need to acknowledge every minute variation in the shade of blue to know that blue exists. To a large extent, **we have an automated attitude to the world** (until now I hadn’t stopped to consider the keyboard I’ve been typing on). And **with automation comes a tacit acceptance of everything around us. Loftier preoccupation with meaning is often relegated to the gods.** But on a local level, **how can I fully understand the existence of the colour blue independent of my perception of it? We don’t have to dig terribly deep into our everyday world of perception before we come to realise that we don’t truly understand anything. The best we can hope for is to understand our own version of something.** I have to understand my own superficial experience with my keyboard because I can never understand yours.

### **Contention 1 is the Method**

#### **For a person to make claim to a set, universal morality is to have claimed to have reached an end point. “Meaning creation” is nothing more than giving up on further inquiry. What if time changes the conclusions or conditions were reported incorrectly? Does it mean the statement was always false? Is it still true? Could the result be what is false? All attempts to describe existence come up short in some regard and our failure to accept this fact create a dangerous affirmation of present power structures.**

Marc **Silversteen** **1993** (“Harold Pinter and the Language of Cultural Power”)

For Althusser, **the** ideological **field in which** our **subjectivity emerges** does not so much resolves as **mystif[ies]y this ambiguity**. Through its various codes and discourses, **ideology supports and ensures the reproduction of the cultural order by serving as a “mirror” in which we find consolingly unified and coherent images of the self with which to identify.** **These images**, however, are a little more than lived fictions generated from within the Other’s discursive field **guarantee**ing **that all our actions will be** socially appropriate, i.e. **actions that never challenge the dominant values**, desires, imperatives, and prohibitions that constitute the Law of Culture. **The power of ideology thus resides in its ability to produce subjects who (mis)recognize** themselves as “centres of initiatives,” without understanding that their illusory autonomy is merely a sign of **their subjection to and thorough internalization of** the Other’s **Law**. For Althusser, then, the **kind of freedom and authenticity** **that** existentialism and other **philosophies of individualism privilege** cannot be opposed to the Law since they **are the most fundamental images produced by the ideolog**ical machiner**y** **of the Law**.

#### **The aff specifically engages in this with their use of the value structure as a description of absolute meaning. Specifically they use phrases like “\_\_\_\_\_\_\_” and “\_\_\_\_\_\_\_” that claim to reach a definitive solution and thus an endpoint to process of inquiry. This type of thinking leads us to blindly accept dominant ideologies and thus fail to challenge oppression**

#### **Instead we must embrace the absurd. The absurd is the fact that our understandings of existence is never able to be reconciled with the reality of the universe.**

#### **We must view this round as a step in our ongoing process of inquiry and refusal to accept any endpoint.**

#### **Therefore, my advocacy is this:**

#### **Vote neg to reject absolute claims to meaning by the affirmative and instead use the round as a moment to embrace the absurdity of life. When you vote neg, it is a literal acceptance of this view.**

#### ***The role of the ballot, then, is to vote for whomever best performatively and methodologically embraces the absurdity of meaning.***

### **Contention 2 is the Performance**

**In c-x you witnessed the breakdown of meaning. The line of questioning that I performed recreated a scene from Harold Pinter’s play The Birthday Party. The scene demonstrates the way that both ideology and language eventually collapse. It was my opponent’s way of understanding the world and accepted codes of conduct that prevented them from being able to answer me. This performance served to unnerve the audience and underline the way words maintain power. This is why we must reject any claim that language can create a “true” meaning as that only forecloses upon future possibilities. My performance is key to showing the audience the absurdity of the human situation.**

**Azizmohammad and Kohzadi 2k11** (Fatemeh and Hamedreza. The Language of the Absurd Theatre in Pinter’s Birthday Party. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research. Department of English Literature, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran p. 2061)

**Pinter’s dialogues are so created that the [maintain] ambiguity is maintained and yet they unnerve the audience** and open several avenues for interpretations. In this context, Hobe (1971:418) says: “Pinter has consistently relied upon language device for his effects rather than ritualistic visual devices characteristic of the theatre of Absurd”. Pinter uses silence and pauses as mediums of communication. He says that the characters convey a lot by being silent or giving a pause during their conversation, both the actors and the spectators are left wondering as to what would follow. **Terror is intensified further with the** arrival of two agents who start **interrogation and cross-examination**. They accuse him of unknown guilt and sins. Stanley remains speechless and only makes the inarticulate gurgling sounds. **His silence only denotes the gradual fading of memory, the disintegration of the human personality. In the process of cross-examination words become weapons.** Stanley is virtually brain-washed through a flood of incomprehensible questions.

#### **Suddenly, language loses its power. It becomes meaningless, just Humanity vs. Language.**

**Azizmohammad and Kohzadi 2** p.2061

As a whole, Harold **Pinter’s** **play**s **reveal our state of solitude, nothingness, meaninglessness and isolation**. In Pinter’s world, **language has lost its semantic power and significance.** **The characters** in The Birthday Party **are neither capable using the language**; language for them is like movement, the irrationality, aggressiveness and violence. **Language**, like an absurd hero, **brings to the audience the absurdity of human situation**. Pinter succeeds in creating an allegorical drama of epic proportions: Man versus his birth and existence, or **Man versus language**. But, though Man is foredoomed to failure in any epical battle between himself and nature, fails heroically. Absurdity engulfs everything and everyone, even language and life itself.

#### **The dramatic setting of the play mirrors that of our round and is the link: a small room with people incapable of communicating yet filled with anxiety over their security. The irresolvable tension between these two factors is the absurdity that systems of meaning create.**

**Azizmohammad and Kohzadi 3 p.2060**

Harold Pinter presents the same Theatre of the Absurd one finds in the plays of Beckett and Ionesco. **Pinter**, however, **presents** his plays in a **deceptively realistic** idioms and **convention and** goes to **unmask the absurdity of the human situation** and the conventional theatre. The Birthday Party has a credible dramatic situation, but not a credible plot structure, characters or any logical, progressive and linear action. **In Pinter’s theatre, the** persistent **presence of a closed room, with a few persons** huddled together inside, **in a sort of “non-communicative conversation”, is significant**. **The** dramatic **image** of his play **is based on a basic human situation: individual’s search for security in a world** which is **full of** anxiety, terror, false friendship and **a lack of understanding** between **people** “We live **on the verge of disaster**” [Esslin: 1970: 23].

#### **Therefore, definitive statements that seek to resolve security only re-entrench the precariousness of our own existence.**

#### **Basically it breaks down like this: when we have preconfigured modes of understanding, such as moral codes and language, they impose limits on what we think and are able to express. To fully understand our world we must move beyond these barriers. The impact is that only then are we able to experience freedom and appreciate the true essence of life.**

**Azizmohammad and Kohzadi [4] (p 2059)**

In this drama, everything eventually becomes unreliable, even the language. **Language**, as a means of communication, **becomes a vehicle of conventionalized**, stereotyped **meaningless exchange**. **Words fail to express the essence of human experiences**, not being able to penetrate beyond its surface. **The Theatre of the Absurd shows language as** a very unreliable **an**d **insufficient tool of communication**. **By ridiculing** conventionalized and **stereotyped speech patterns**, **the theatre** of the Absurd **tries to make[s] people aware of the possibility of going beyond** everyday **speech conventions and communicating** more **authentically**. Conventionalized speech acts as a barrier between us and the world outside. In order to come into direct contact with natural reality**, it is necessary to discredit** and discord the false crutches of **conventionalized language**. Within the world of the Absurd, each individual identity is defined by language; having a name is the source of our separateness, the loss of logical language brings us towards a unity with living things. In the Theatre of the Absurd **language**, as an agent of logical world, **encloses the true self, which belongs to the world of infinite.** **In the world of Absurd, each individual confronts with intoxicating freedom, which brings** once **the essence of life.**